

I submit, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, he does not really have to look too far. All he has to do is look at his policies and see what has generated crime particularly with our juveniles in this country. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if we look at the policy of the past 40 years—the policy of the other side of the aisle, we will see what they have sown we are now reaping with our children.

I submit that people who laughed at Dan Quayle when he talked about family values are now having a sober moment, and all we need do my colleagues, is look at what we have legislated in this country to see what our children are doing. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the United States can offer curfews, he can offer uniforms, he can offer to regulate cigarettes, he can offer to put v-chips in televisions, and those are not the answers of what is wrong or what will cure the problems with our young people.

I say to my colleagues that what this Congress has done, creating a system of dependency, creating a system of welfare, creating a system where a child has not seen a parent work, where we have lost the work ethic, where the answer is that government should come up with another program, another credit, another directive from Washington; that is what the answers have been, and this is what we receive.

And then we look at the problems. The President is meeting with local law enforcement agencies' officers and agencies, and I have met with them, and they tell us that 70 percent of the crime in this country is related to drugs. We spent, during the Reagan and the Bush administration, years getting drug use to go down, telling students just say "no," and what did this President do? First he fired just about everyone in the drug czar's office. What was his next step? He hired a chief health officer of the country, who turned into a farce, Jocelyn Elders, and what did she say? She said, "Just say 'maybe'." Our kids are not dumb; they saw what this meant: Try it. And they are trying it, and we are reaping the harvest of this administration.

And then he cut interdiction, interdiction, 70 percent of the drugs coming through Mexico, and rewarded Mexico. This is the policy that we have seen. We know we can legislate, and unless we pass legislation that encourages families to care for their own, unless we return to Judeo-Christian values, until we have a tax policy that does not take away opportunities for our young people to work with minimum wage, unless we say that, "Children, yes, you have to work and you will receive. We must stop asking what Washington can do for you. It's what you can do for yourself."

Until we get back to some work ethic in this country, until we stop forcing people to live in public housing—I saw on television where a little girl choked to death on a roach in public housing

and last night watched on TV the public housing that we would not put our dog in, and that is the alternative that is offered by the other side, these old ideas, and that is what we are seeing in our public housing facilities.

So the problem is here in Congress. We have created the problem. And we will have a choice, the American people will have a choice. Do we continue down the path of the last 40 years, do we continue with ignoring the drug policy? The President mentioned children in one speech 46 times, but he rarely mentions the drug problem in this country: heroin on the increase, methamphetamines, designer drugs, cocaine, marijuana that is frying the brains of our young people, and he will not mention it, and the media will not mention it.

Someone has got to mention it because this is destroying this generation, and I have had it with this administration, I have had it with this President, and I have had it with the solutions of the other side of this aisle, and it is time we got serious and answered the real problems facing our children and our country.

AMERICAN WORKERS NEED PORTABILITY IN HEALTH INSURANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning business for 4 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today is a very sad day from the point of view of the Nation's health insurance needs, and I say that because later on this morning there will be a motion to go to conference on the health care insurance reform bill, the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill as it is known, and will also be dealing with a budget that has come back from a conference between the House and the Senate which makes major negative—has a major negative impact on the Medicare and Medicaid Program. And it really did not have to be this way, but unfortunately the Republican leadership keeps insisting on raiding Medicare and Medicaid primarily to pay tax breaks for wealthy Americans and also insists on putting in what I call, and the President has called, I think, the poison pill into the Kennedy-Kassebaum health care reform legislation of medical savings accounts.

If I could just take a minute, Mr. Speaker, to explain why I think that there are some very bad developments that are occurring today primarily because of the Republican leadership's insistence on catering to special interests. The Kennedy-Kassebaum health care reform bill was basically put forward by the two Senators on a bipartisan basis because they recognized that increasingly it is difficult for many people to get health insurance in this country. People who were working, people who are out there who are employed have a difficult time getting

health insurance or transferring their health insurance if they lose their jobs or they go to a new job. And so on a bipartisan basis the Senators, Senator KENNEDY and Senator KASSEBAUM, said that they would like to make some changes, relatively minor changes, but still significant for a lot of people in this country, that would allow people, when they lose a job or change jobs, to take their health insurance with them, this so-called portability concept, and also that people who have preexisting conditions, who have had handicaps, who have operations or whatever, who oftentimes find it difficult to buy health insurance would not be short-changed, would still be able to buy health insurance because preexisting conditions, health conditions, could not be a basis, in many cases, for denying them coverage.

Well, we were all very much in favor of that. But here comes the Republican leadership, specifically Speaker GINGRICH, that want to attach to that very good legislation what they call medical savings accounts, which I call nothing more than a way for the healthy and the wealthy in this country to take advantage of health insurance at the expense of everyone else. What medical savings accounts do is basically allow people to opt for catastrophic coverage, and they pay out of pocket for the coverage for other daily expenses that are not part of that catastrophic umbrella policy.

The problem with it is that it breaks the health insurance pool. The reason why health insurance stays at a certain level and the price does not go up even more is because everyone is in the insurance pool. But if we take the healthy and wealthy out of the pool and we give them a catastrophic umbrella policy, then the people that are left in the insurance pool end up paying more because they are poorer and less healthy. And that is what the medical savings accounts seek to do. They are healthy, wealthy savings accounts essentially, and we know that the consequence of them is that the average costs of health insurance will go up for those people who are employed and in the work force.

□ 0930

So I once again say today, we must put a stop to this Republican policy. Essentially it is an effort to act for special interests. There is the Golden Rule Insurance Co. that has contributed a lot to the Republican Party over the years that has been advocating these special type of accounts for the healthy and the wealthy and until we put a stop to it we are not going to see the basic health insurance reforms that are important as part of the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill. We also have the budget coming up today which once again makes deep cuts in Medicare and Medicaid to pay primarily for tax breaks for wealthy Americans. On Medicare what we are seeing is cuts of about \$168 billion and also major restructuring of

Medicare that will result in doctors being allowed for the first time to overcharge the seniors. Seniors right now are capped.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The time of the gentleman has expired.

MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, is recognized during morning business for 4 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a lot of people who are here today and Members that are watching in their offices, this is our morning hour that each of us can get up and talk at this time for 4 minutes on issues that concern us.

A lot of us, whether you are Republican or Democrat, were concerned last week about the Medicare trustees issuing their report on the status of the Medicare trust fund. The trustees said that if nothing is done, the trust fund will be insolvent in the year 2001. This is a serious problem which the Congress should address in a bipartisan way.

However, instead of addressing this short-term problem of Medicare, because it is a short term, it was addressed in 1993 and extended it, and now we need to do it again. We should have done it in 1995 and now we should do it in 1996, to move the year out from 2001 to 2005 and hopefully 2010. But the Republican majority continue to insist that the way to do that is to cut Medicare trust funds and yet at the same time provide even more money in tax cuts.

Again this year the numbers have gone down. In 1995 we were looking at \$270 billion cuts in Medicare and \$245 billion in tax cuts. Well, this year it has gone down to where we want to cut \$168 billion in Medicare over 6 years and provide another \$176 billion in tax cuts. The cuts in Medicare are the cuts in the expected growth. The reason that is hard, I know a lot of times people listen and say, "Well, it's not really a cut in Medicare," and it is not. There is a growth in Medicare. But we have to have the expected growth in Medicare because there are more seniors growing into Medicare every day and if we just match inflation, then we are going behind and the people who are there now, the 70-year-olds, the 80-year-olds who are on Medicare are going to see a cut in the services they have. That is why it is a cut in Medicare even though it is a cut in the growth. But again we need to deal with Medicare and not talk about the tax cuts because they are irresponsible.

There is no free lunch. We learned that in the 1980's when Congress passed tax cut after tax cut and yet increased spending. You cannot cut taxes and increase spending. That is what they are looking for. There is no pain-free that you can do. But they have conven-

iently forgot that the last time Congress did this in the 1980's with a Republican President and Democratic Congresses, that is why we now have a \$5 trillion debt, and that is why it needs to be dealt with. But that was not done just by Democrats. In fact the last balanced budget we had in this country was in 1969 at the height of the Vietnam war and also at the height of the Great Society. So do not let anyone tell you that the Great Society causes debt. It is Congress not being able to control its expenditures on a yearly basis. We are still living with these consequences of the 1980's.

Now we have the summer movie season. For a year and a half the Republicans have been trying to write a sequel to the supply-side deficit from the 1980's. We call that "The Original." In Congress they offered the tax cuts and told the public we would grow ourselves out of deficits and into prosperity. In the sequel now we are seeing they want to offset their tax cuts with Medicare cuts. Unfortunately for the American people the sequels are rarely as good as the original and that is what worries me.

One of the other ways that they talk about preserving Medicare is medical savings accounts. Again we are considering a bill today for health care for everyone and hopefully we would have a health care reform bill. But it is going to die on the cross of the medical savings accounts and that is what is frustrating, because medical savings accounts, I can go out now or any individual can go out and buy a high deductible insurance policy now that says, "OK, I'll pay my first \$5,000." The problem is that the Republicans and medical savings accounts want to give that \$5,000 as a deductible on their taxes. This is the same Congress in the 1980's that removed the tax deductions for average individuals for buying regular medical care policies. If we are going to do it for the rich, then we need to do it for everyone who buys any type of health care policy. Let us make all health care premiums deductible and not just those for the rich.

HOUSE SET TO ELIMINATE BILINGUAL VOTING BALLOTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, later today the House Judiciary Committee will mark up legislation repealing the federally mandated law which requires bilingual voting ballots. It is about time this action was taken.

In the United States today there are some 375 voting districts across this country that require the printing of ballots in foreign languages.

In theory, these services should not be needed at all. Voting rights are extended to American citizens and, by law, English is a requirement for citi-

zenship in this country. In 1905 this Congress passed a law that said that in order for one to be a citizen and to vote, one had to have a working knowledge of the English language, so we should not even be providing government services in direct contradiction to the spirit of the law.

So I think this legislation which is before the Committee on the Judiciary today is preeminently legislation that we should be addressing now and should also be voting on this session of the Congress. These services of bilingual ballots are very expensive and unnecessary. By and large, multilingual ballots are rarely requested and even less often used than they are anticipated.

In one recent election in California, it cost something like \$100 per ballot that was used. So not only are bilingual ballots in contradiction to the present law, the spirit of the law, but also they cost the taxpayers one heck of a lot of money.

These ballots have other, more serious costs associated with them, too. For example, providing these special services creates the fiction that newcomers in this country can enjoy all the benefits of citizenship without learning the language of the land.

It is important to remember that if one wants to be successful and have their children be successful in our country, that the new Americans I think realize more than anyone else that the ladder of opportunity, the rungs of that, are the English language. Because in order for one to read a want ad, in order for one to fill out applications, in order for one to become integrated into the society, English is extremely important. One cannot become successful unless one has a good understanding of the English language. I think reality tells us that this is true.

Also, exercising one's rights of citizenship involves more than just casting a vote. It means making a thoughtful decision regarding the issues and the candidate. Multilingual voting ballots give individuals the right to vote without granting them the power to cast an informed vote. How can a person who is not versed in at least a working knowledge of the English language take part in the political campaign, listen to the debates, listen to the issues and therefore cast an informed ballot?

Mr. Speaker, multilingual ballots are another vestige of the 1960's obsession with the Great Society and the caretaker state in the 1960's, when we had the Great Society and government was going to do everything for everybody. Now this vision of government is bankrupt and we must dismantle the legislative relics of that era. That is why the legislation which is only a first step that is being taken up in the Committee on the Judiciary today is so important, because it is getting us back on the track of commonsense government again.